

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
Cultural Heritage	
Halton Region Nancy Mott-Allen, Manager, Current Planning (May 24, 2005)	<p>Appreciates being circulated this documentation for review and remains interested in future Official Plan Review circulations from Brampton.</p> <p>The Region of Halton does not have any comment on the Cultural Heritage Discussion Paper but would like to be kept informed as this policy develops.</p>
Ministry of Culture Shari Prowse Heritage Planner/Archaeologist (June 9, 2005)	<p>The document is quite comprehensive and it is hoped that many of the recommendations will be reflected in the revisions to the current Official Plan. Indicates that as Bill 60 has been passed, the legislative changes should be addressed as part of any revision to the Official Plan.</p> <p>Will offer detailed comments later as part of the One Window Official Plan Review process.</p>
Region of Peel Tom Slomke Planning Manager-Brampton Development Planning Services (May 27, 2005)	<p>The Region is encouraged with the proactive initiatives proposed by the Discussion Paper as they are consistent with the Peel Official Plan and the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS).</p> <p>Heritage Conservation District Designation</p> <p>As stated in Policy 3.6.2.2, the Region supports the designation of Heritage Conservation District.</p> <p>Notes that one or more additional Heritage Conservation District are being suggested in the Downtown Brampton area.</p> <p>Provincial policies, articulated in the PPS (2005) stress the need for intensification of built-up areas. Brampton has experienced the majority of its growth in the post war period leaving relatively few opportunities to employ intensification strategies. When the heritage planning process begins, the PPS will require that they consider the provincial program for intensification as an option or alternative to the heritage district designation.</p> <p>The proposed Ontario Heritage Act (Bill 60) includes a provision (41.2) that prohibits a municipality from carrying out public works that are contrary to the objectives set out in the Heritage District Plan. The Region of Peel is responsible for some public works and would be required to conform to the Heritage District Plan. Theoretically, Regional Standards for public works may be compromised by the policies of the District Plan. Suggests that if a Heritage District Plan is pursued, the plan needs to specifically examine the issue of Regional Public Works and the Standards applicable within the proposed district.</p> <p>Property Tax Rebate Programs</p> <p>It is an objective of the Peel Official Plan to “support the heritage programs and policies of the area municipalities” (3.6.1.4). Proposed in the Discussion Paper is a Property Tax program</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
	<p>whereby between 10 and 40% of the property tax could be rebated for eligible properties. The program could apply to designated properties, property subject to a heritage easement or properties within a designated conservation district. Regional staff find the technique innovative and interesting.</p> <p>However, the region has stated some concerns regarding the adoption of a similar program. The Region is dependent upon the tax base as the local municipality but responsible for three communities and a different set of mandates. The region must therefore be concerned with the financial prudence of its policies with respect to its roles and goals for the whole Region and cannot entertain participation in similar programs without the specific and deliberate consideration of a region-wide policy. Any participation by the Region in such program requires specific and deliberate action and consideration.</p> <p>Development Charges Credit</p> <p>The Discussion Paper proposes consideration of mechanism under the Development Charges Act to compensate owners who for preserving heritage properties, and possibly denying a Development Charge Credit for the demolition of designated buildings.</p> <p>While Regional Staff find the technique innovative and interesting, they are not aware of any enabling legislation permitting this technique. If the local municipality wishes to extend a credit for heritage purposes, it may have to fund such credit from its own resources and not from the larger pool of Development Charge Fund.</p> <p>The legislation is clear that development charge is to apply to the increase services required of the development and it has been common practice to 'credit' an existing development that is to be removed to make way for the proposed development toward the calculation of the increased service provided. Have doubt about the justification for applying this principle to existing building of heritage significance, or the denial of Development Charge Credit for demolishing designated buildings.</p> <p>Any participation by the Region in programs affecting the Regional Development Charge By-law requires specific and deliberate actions and considerations separate from the actions taken on the City of Brampton Development Charge By-law.</p> <p>Secondary Plans and Block Plans</p> <p>The Region agree with the initiative and will cooperate with the City in the regard of considering cultural heritage issues, inventories and policies earlier in the planning and development review process, in particular at the Block Plan Stage.</p> <p>The PPS (Section 2.6.3) suggests that where development is proposed near a heritage property, an assessment of the impact</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
	<p>can be requested. This idea supports the suggestion that a heritage impact study be carried out and submitted with a Plan of Subdivision Application and possibly at the Block Plan stage funded and implemented through the Cost Sharing Agreement.</p> <p>Heritage Subdivision</p> <p>Understand that this technique has been used in other Ontario municipalities with some success. The Region will consider this option when heritage buildings are required to be moved as a result of Regional projects.</p> <p>Use of Heritage Inventory</p> <p>It has been pointed out that identification of properties in the Heritage inventory has been used to treat properties 'as if designated'. The Region has experienced this when acquiring properties and buildings for Regional projects. Time has been lost and extra funds expended as a result of processes and requirements that have come as a surprise to project managers. It is hoped that these incidents would be avoided if "The City will continue to maintain close liaison with the Region in major infrastructure and road construction projects to ensure better communication and cooperation in heritage conservation efforts needed", as stated in the Discussion Paper. Nevertheless, there remains the issue that 'natural justice' may not be fully served if no chance to discuss and/or appeal the 'heritage status' of the building has been allowed to occur within the process.</p> <p>Heritage Security Bonds</p> <p>The Region is unaware of any enabling legislation for this initiative and warns that inclusion of a policy in the Official Plan to that effect does not legitimize the activity either. Question whether the initiative should be included as an Official Plan Policy.</p> <p>Local Objectives</p> <p>Consider it appropriate for the Official Plan to include a statement to clarify the history that the City is attempting to protect, as suggested in the Discussion Paper.</p> <p>Indicates that much of the history of the Brampton community stems from its role as the County Seat of the County of Peel. In this respect, the Region and the City have much heritage to share and encourage continued co-operation with the Peel Heritage Centre.</p> <p>Peel Heritage Complex</p> <p>The Discussion Paper proposes that the Peel Heritage Complex be used as a facility to store heritage documents and artifacts. Happy to report that the Peel Heritage Complex will continue to serve Brampton provided it is able to do so and provided that the acquisition policies of the Peel Heritage Centre are satisfied.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
	<p>Draft Approval Conditions</p> <p>The Discussion Paper proposes conditions of Draft Plan Approval that land owners secure existing buildings from possible damage. The proposed condition is not about the land and may not be within the spirit of the enabling legislation. It may also come late in the land development process. Nevertheless, this technique may prove valuable for the protection of heritage resources.</p> <p>Archaeological Master Plan</p> <p>The proposed undertaking of an Archaeological Master Plan is considered useful in reducing unnecessary assessments and protecting significant archaeological resources.</p>
Brampton Heritage Board	The correspondence including the Brampton Official Plan Review Cultural Heritage Discussion Paper was received by the Board at its May 17, 2005 Meeting. (HB062-2005)
Urban Form	
Peel Regional Police Crime Prevention Services Cst. Tom McKay June 24, 2005	<p>Note and support the reference to the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design Principles as mentioned under Section 6.8 General Urban Form Principles-Safety.</p> <p>Suggest amending Introduction in Section 4.10 Urban Form in the Official Plan to read</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“To utilize, manage and conserve our resources in a pro-active way to achieve a safe and attractive built and natural environment.”</p>
City of Mississauga Planning and Building Department Ron Miller, Planner, Policy Planning July 21, 2005	No comment on the Discussion Paper and appreciate the opportunity for reviewing the document.
Region of Peel Development Planning Services Tom Slomke, Planning Manager- Brampton July 22, 2005	<p>Commend the City’s effort in the Urban Form and Development Design Discussion Paper to enhance the physical environment in the City and Peel Region. The City’s proposals will make a significant contribution to the Provincial Policy Statement’s (PPS) goal of promoting development with greater density and making our built environment transit-supportive and pedestrian-friendly. Policies 5.3 and 7.4 of the Regional Official Plan also support Brampton’s initiatives.</p> <p>The Region however has some concerns over the potential impact of enhanced design guidelines including financial, functional and community.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
	<p>Financial Implications</p> <p><u>Increased cost</u> There is a presumption that new development design guidelines will increase initial capital costs of future Regional projects. The costs could range from new and additional design studies, application review, increased building and landscaping costs and greater administrative burdens in construction supervision and inspection. To the extent that this assumption is true, enhanced standards will impact the Region's financial ability to fund its future programs.</p> <p><u>Impact relative to Development Charge funded projects</u> Cost estimates for future projects must be based on the last 10-year average. If costs increase due to higher aesthetic standards, there would likely be a shortfall between the money collected under the Development Charge By-law and the actual costs which need to be financed through other ways. The additional costs may have to be borne through taxation as it is the Region's policy that growth pays for itself. Indicate that the City may face a similar dilemma.</p> <p><u>Increased Maintenance Costs</u> Indicate that enhanced landscaping may not reduce long-term maintenance costs for some Regional projects. Of even greater concern is replacement cost. Cite example of enhanced streetscape on Regional roads. Plants and ornamental features must be replaced as a result of destruction during emergency or routine repair maintenance activities. The Region has a policy of minimal landscaping on Regional roads and easements for this very reason.</p> <p>Functional Impacts</p> <p>Advise that the current typical regional road right-of-way (ROW) is 45m. To meet the goal of creating pedestrian-friendly streetscapes, the ROW width for regional roads will have to be widened to accommodate design features such as street lighting, sidewalks, pedestrian routes, transit facilities, landscaping etc, and in order not to strain design and safety standards. Indicate that it is often not possible to achieve such wide ROW for reconstruction projects.</p> <p>Impact on housing affordability</p> <p>Concern that higher aesthetic standards may have impact on the cost of affordable and social housing. These projects are dependent on senior government financing and subject to approval to meet local municipal design standards.</p> <p>Impact on intensification</p> <p>Note that there is a suggestion on seeking harmonious integration of new and existing development in scale, form and character. Hope that this principle will not be used as a method of turning</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
	<p>down development because it is “ugly” or not similar to those existing.</p> <p>Favourable impact of landscaping</p> <p>In addition to aesthetics and contribution to the Flower City vision, the benefits of landscaping to the environment including air, water, and wild life ecology should also be stressed.</p> <p>Request</p> <p>Request that the Brampton Official Plan to include a policy to state that any design guidelines that may have impact on the costs or function of Regional projects should be prepared in consultation with the Region.</p>
Environment/Open Space	
<p>Gartner Lee Limited (On Behalf of Great Gulf Homes)</p> <p>Dale A. Leadbeater, Senior Biologist</p> <p>July 15, 2005</p>	<p>Include policies in Official Plan clearly state that Schedule D is an approximation of landscape conditions and that the final valley delineation will be determined in the field. Any refinement will be used during preparation of the Environmental Implementation Review.</p> <p>Great Gulf Group is in receipt of more recent crest of slope mapping from Credit Valley Conservation. Request that the City of Brampton update the valleylands on Schedule D to reflect the updated crest of slope mapping.</p> <p>Specific woodlots have been identified on a map provided by Gartner Lee, where the woodlots are in question based on studies that have been undertaken. Gartner Lee has identified four areas on a map within the Great Gulf Lands that do not reflect the current planning context or site conditions.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
<p>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority</p> <p>Quentin Hanchard, Senior Planner</p> <p>July 11, 2005</p>	<p>Special Policy Area (SPA) related policies should be included within the Official Plan. Recommend that Special Policy Areas (SPAs) be added to Schedule D (CD provided)</p> <p>Further discussions need to take place regarding an acceptable level of development intensification within the SPA's in the City of Brampton.</p> <p>Strongly supports the review of the current buffer requirements and the inclusion of applicable related policies in the Official Plan.</p> <p>TRCA suggests that a maximum 10-meter conservation buffer be considered to recognize the difference in requirements between TRCA and CVC. Suggest a meeting between City staff, TRCA and CVC to discuss a common approach to the application of conservation buffers in Brampton.</p> <p>Strong emphasis on connectivity and linkages. Include policies in the Official Plan that consider both the larger cumulative impacts of removing and/or enhancing existing natural features, as well as considering the significance of features to Brampton at a City wide scale.</p> <p>Emphasize equal protection of features, functions and linkages and promote restoration and enhancement of natural areas, features and linkages</p> <p>Apply principles of the TRCA's Terrestrial Natural Heritage System</p> <p>Provide policy direction for new development to protect, maintain, enhance and restore ecosystem attributes and values</p> <p>Integrate systems based approach throughout Official Plan</p> <p>Explore opportunities to integrate policies that support sustainable development in the Official Plan.</p> <p>Include policies promoting energy conservation and target improvements to air quality. Address water, land and soil conservation</p> <p>Include policies for sustainable community design such as conservation subdivisions and transit/pedestrian oriented design.</p> <p>Confirm that data sources are up to date including conservation lands, all wetlands and ANSI's (CD provided). Follow up with MNR to ensure that most recent Provincial data has been used.</p> <p>TRCA is completing mapping of vegetation communities of concern, which are identified using up to date ecological land classification. Mapping for all of Brampton is not yet complete and suggest Brampton use data layer, but note it will be continuously updated.</p> <p>Confirm that the entire Mimico Headwater Wetland Complex is indicated on Schedule D (specifically on the east side of Bramalea Road, just north of Larkspur)</p> <p>CD includes additional wetlands within the TRCA jurisdiction identified through ELC fieldwork.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
Ministry of Culture Shari Prowswe, Heritage Planner July 7, 2005	Will provide comments as part of the One Window Official Plan Review Process.
Town of Halton Hills Bashar Al-Hussaini, Policy Planner June 29/05	Modifications recommended in the Discussion Paper are appropriate, therefore the Town of Halton Hills has no concern with the proposed amendments to the Brampton Official Plan.
Metrus Development Inc. Darren Steedman, Project Manager July 4, 2005	<p>Emphasize the importance of the cooperation of the development industry in implementing initiatives of the Official Plan Review</p> <p>For storm water management ponds to be a recreational feature in a neighbourhood, additional requirements are necessary beyond the functional engineering requirements.</p> <p>Appropriate to credit landowners for parkland dedication for the areas that are beyond the functional engineering requirements of storm ponds as they function as a passive recreation park.</p> <p>Since hedgerows are proposed to be removed from Schedule D, reference to hedgerows should be removed from all sections of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Section 4.4.7.13 of the Official Plan is too detailed and does not reflect typical woodlot management practices in the City of Brampton.</p> <p>Emphasize the importance of the cooperation of the development industry in implementing initiatives of the Official Plan Review</p> <p>For storm water management ponds to be a recreational feature in a neighbourhood, additional requirements are necessary beyond the functional engineering requirements.</p> <p>Appropriate to credit landowners for parkland dedication for the areas that are beyond the functional engineering requirements of storm ponds as they function as a passive recreation park.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
	<p>Since hedgerows are proposed to be removed from Schedule D, reference to hedgerows should be removed from all sections of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Section 4.4.7.13 of the Official Plan is too detailed and does not reflect typical woodlot management practices in the City of Brampton.</p> <p>Policies should be revised to provide more flexibility when management or safety concerns are raised.</p> <p>In the event that wetland buffers are required, and parkland dedication credit is not provided, then recreational trails or other public uses should not be provided within the buffer area.</p> <p>Any wording related to the development of natural or man made linkages should be removed from the Official Plan unless landowners are compensated.</p> <p>Again hedgerows should be removed as they do not warrant preservation under current environmental initiatives and impede other requirements such as the efficient use of land.</p> <p>If additional lands are required to locate recreational trails, landowners should be provided satisfactory compensation.</p> <p>In the opinion of Metrus, the current approach to establishing setbacks is working well as the Conservation Authorities and the City are achieving their objectives.</p> <p>If a blanket policy is to be looked at, it should contain flexibility because all valleylands, watercourses and wetlands range in significance and setback requirements.</p> <p>Further information should be provided to discuss the financial implications of the policies inherent within the Discussion Paper together with a funding mechanism for uncommon land requirements.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
<p>Region of Peel</p> <p>Development Planning Services</p> <p>Tom Slomke, Planning Manager-Brampton</p> <p>July 12, 2005</p>	<p>Water Resources</p> <p>Watershed planning policies should be included within the Official Plan outlining the requirements and sequencing studies similar to the policies included in the recent Brampton Official Plan Amendment for North West Brampton.</p> <p>This work integrate watershed planning requirements into municipal land use planning and clarify when such plans and studies are required before development proceeds.</p> <p>Provide detailed framework that Official Plan policies could include.</p> <p>Include policies for the monitoring of watershed conditions and policies for the updating of subwatershed studies.</p> <p>Include watershed and sub-watershed boundaries on a schedule or appendix to the Official Plan. This map could also include the status of subwatershed studies.</p> <p>Groundwater</p> <p>Recommend that terminology be updated related to groundwater resources</p> <p>Provide direction for the identification, protection, improvement or restoration of groundwater features important in the context of Brampton's hydrogeologic setting.</p> <p>Policies should provide direction for the identification of sand lenses, and provide policy direction on how impacts to these and other groundwater features are managed through the planning process.</p> <p>Inclusion of a policy to identify the requirements for the completion of a groundwater assessment prior to approval of secondary plans or block plans, and to address the potential cumulative impacts of development on private drinking water resources.</p> <p>Natural Heritage Systems Policies</p> <p>ROP provides detailed policy components to be considered related to the Natural Heritage Systems Policies, including identification of the present and proposed natural heritage system, identify where features where development is not permitted, identify lands adjacent to natural features where environmental impact studies may be required etc.</p> <p>Include a policy that if natural features are destroyed or damaged, that there is no adjustment in the boundary of the feature and that restoration/rehabilitation of the area will be required.</p> <p>Include policies outlining the process whereby the Region of Peel scans development applications to determine if the development is within an area containing endangered or threatened species.</p> <p>Regional Official Plan Amendment 16</p> <p>Brampton's Official Plan should recognize the linkage between the transportation system and the natural environment.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
	<p>Woodlands</p> <p>Include policies related to a target for tableland woodlot vegetation in Brampton</p> <p>Valleylands and Watercourses</p> <p>Include clear policies to prohibit development and site alteration within significant valleylands.</p> <p>Policies should be included that generally prohibit development, site alteration and establishment or expansion of aggregate extraction from valley and stream corridors having a drainage area of 125 ha or greater and identified as NACs in the ROP</p> <p>Support a consistent approach to identifying and protecting all natural features as well as how to determine appropriate buffers.</p> <p>Buffers, Setbacks and Linkages</p> <p>Update policies to reflect current best practices and ecological concepts.</p> <p>Update policies related to connectivity within the natural heritage system fully meets the intent of the new PPS and the Regional Official Plan policies to protect natural features from incompatible development.</p> <p>Greenbelt Plan</p> <p>Policies related to the Natural Heritage System, Water Resources System and Agricultural Systems should be included within the City of Brampton Official Plan.</p> <p>Regional staff will be meeting with the Province to discuss if and how significant features can be identified and shown.</p> <p>Functional Use of Bicycle Network</p> <p>Suggest that Brampton consider the utilitarian aspect of the bicycling network including the need to enhance east-west linkages.</p> <p>Urban Agriculture</p> <p>The City's open space policies should identify how urban agriculture can remain as a land use and contribute toward achievement of sustainability objectives.</p> <p>Include policies that suitable land uses designations, policies and guidelines would protect lands for farming.</p> <p>Continue to include policies related to the phasing of development to ensure an orderly transition to urban uses recognizing that urban agriculture may remain as part of the urban fabric.</p> <p>Brampton may want to consider appropriate polices related to farming being permitted as a use, to allow secondary uses included 'agri-tainment' or 'agri-tourism' to improve the economic viability of farming.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
	<p>Expanded Environment</p> <p>Identify other aspects of the environment that could be addressed in policy related to: linkages between the environment and transportation, land use, health etc; air quality; demand management of energy; renaturalization; cleaning up contaminated sites; etc.</p> <p>Mapping</p> <p>Schedule D – Verify with Regional staff that the mapping is consistent with the Regional Official Plan for the identification of Core Areas.</p> <p>Appendix O- Request that Appendix O be a full schedule to the Brampton Official Plan, not an Appendix.</p> <p>The use of Flood and Fill Line Extension data to map valleylands within the TRCA jurisdiction is not consistent with the Region of Peels approach, which uses crest of slope.</p> <p>Recommend that the City use the most current data available to accurately map environmental features on Schedule D, particularly in the identification of Core areas, NAC's and PNAC's.</p> <p>Request that Region of Peel Core Areas be depicted on a Schedule to the Official Plan as well as being described in the text.</p> <p>Mapping should depict not only the Greenbelt boundary but also the Protected Countryside and Natural Heritage System within the Greenbelt Area</p> <p>Mapping should indicate the River Valley Connection along the Credit River that would be subject to External Connections policies of the Greenbelt Plan.</p>
<p>Ministry of the Environment Ross Lashbrook, Environmental Assessment and Planning Coordinator June 21, 2005</p>	<p>Will provide comments upon request from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing through the government's One-Window procedure</p>
<p>Peel Regional Police Cst. Tom McKay, Crime Prevention</p>	<p>Additional referenced to safety and/or Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles be added to reflect current practices in the City.</p> <p>Specifically add the word 'safe' where appropriate in Section 4.5.4.5 vi), 4.5.5, and 4.5.7.1</p> <p>Add Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design criteria to the following Sections: 4.5.5.1 and 4.5.6.4.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
<p>Credit River Alliance Lorraine Symmes, Coordinator June 21, 2005</p>	<p>Agree that the City should be leader in environmental responsibility and would suggest that stronger by-laws and regulations be enacted in the City in a proactive manner.</p> <p>Stormwater Management Guidelines should reflect whatever measures are needed to maintain volumes at or near current levels</p> <p>Development should not proceed until they are based on an up to date subwatershed studies.</p> <p>The language currently in the Official Plan is not strong enough related to the protection of locally significant wetlands and woodlots. This wording should be strengthened in the revised policies to assist with the protection of these features.</p> <p>Suggest that the target for vegetative cover within valleylands be increased to 75%, as this is the minimum recommended from Environment Canada for healthy watersheds.</p> <p>Identify the need for stronger sediment control by-law enforcement</p> <p>Encourage Council to set a high priority for the acquisition of sensitive lands.</p>
<p>Peel District School Board Paul Mountford, Intermediate Planning Officer June 20, 2005</p>	<p>Appears to be a conflict between Section 4.5.5.11 and 4.5.5.2.</p> <p>Will the City still be monitoring school lands to ensure that adequate open space is provided in a new area?</p> <p>Suggest adding an addition policy under Section 4.5.6.7 as follows “(v) Integration with elementary schools: wherever practical, Neighbourhood parks should be properly located adjacent to elementary schools to allow for the joint use of sports fields and parking facilities.”</p>
<p>Region of Halton Nancy Mott-Allen, Manager Current Planning and Public Works June 21, 2005</p>	<p>Pleased that several requirements and modifications are being considered to strengthen and support Brampton’s Environmental Policies.</p> <p>No further comments at this time.</p> <p>Continue to provide the Region of Halton with updates with respect to the Official Plan Review.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
<p>Brampton Community Garden Collaborative</p> <p>Sanjeev Goel, Tushar Mehta, Anjali Gupta, Anna Przychodzki, Nancy Emuc and Damian McShane</p> <p>June 27, 2005</p>	<p>Want the City of Brampton to ensure community gardens are a permitted land use within the City's Open Space lands (both recreational and environmental)</p> <p>Request that the City implement a process to identify City owned land that could be considered community garden space and include community gardens as a priority use of City's surplus land.</p> <p>The Brampton Community Garden Collaborative would like to work with the City to develop a model lease and user agreement to define timeframes and rights/responsibilities of all parties.</p>
<p>Brampton Environmental Community Advisory Panel (BECAP)</p> <p>Ernst Braendli, Secretary</p> <p>June 23, 2005</p>	<p>Concern with the careful wording included in Appendix B.</p> <p>Request that wording be changed to give a clear signal to the people of Brampton that the City is taking a major role in the protection of our environment.</p> <p>Recommends that the City establish a permanent panel of environmental experts to advise the City on environmental matters.</p> <p>Would like to see more emphasis on conservation of energy and quality of air, to meet the requirements of the PPS.</p> <p>Concern that the Environment and Open Space is looked at as an item separate from the other pillars of the City's Strategic Plan.</p> <p>Possibly the Official plan could refer to other documents used by other Departments related to achieving a better quality environment.</p> <p>BECAP encourages the City to clearly stat that the protection of our environment is equal to and in some instances takes priority to the development as we know it.</p> <p>The City stated that additional policies should be added under Section 4.5.2 related to working with Conservation Authorities to maximize public access to conservation lands. BECAP would like to ensure that this agreement does not mean the building of new or larger parking lots and rather improve transit to these locations.</p>
<p>Sierra Club of Canada</p> <p>Therese Taylor, Conservation Chair</p> <p>Anna Przychodzki, Secretary</p> <p>June 23, 2005</p>	<p>The majority of concerns raised by the Sierra Club of Peel were related to strengthening the wording included in the Discussion Paper.</p> <p>Suggest that pedestrian/cycling trail systems should continue to be planned for at the Secondary Plan stage to ensure a comprehensive, city wide, interconnected pedestrian and cyclist circulation system.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
<p>Jolanta Rasteniene June 23, 2005</p>	<p>Concern that the residents of Brampton did not have an opportunity to discuss and advise on this plan more widely.</p> <p>Suggest that notice be put on the first page of the City's web site, announcement in the Guardian at least 4 weeks before the commenting deadline, make meetings open to the general public, and meetings should take place in the early morning or evening to accommodate community activists that are working full time.</p> <p>Brampton's Official Plan should be adjusted to Smart Growth Principles in order to improve the health and well being of our community.</p> <p>Agree that it is good to benchmark, however maybe the municipalities selected are not the best.</p> <p>Time to think outside the box and have incentives for businesses that are implementing good environmental practices.</p> <p>Disappointed that Brampton is only going to update the Energy and Air policies.</p> <p>By being a leader in environmental protection, the City also needs to protect citizen's health.</p> <p>Request stronger wording in policies for instance "the City <u>will</u>" and removal of "to the greatest extent possible"</p> <p>Encourage the City to take urgent measures dealing with peak hour transportation problems that impact our community's health and well being.</p> <p>Also to address this matter, the City should significantly increase the share of peak hour travel by pedestrian, cycling and public transport by setting measurable targets.</p> <p>Support the City in approaching the Region of Peel to encourage faster implementation of water related policies in order to ensure that tragedies similar to that of Walkerton, Ontario does not happen again.</p> <p>Additional comments were made on the Pillars of the Strategic Plan and items that should be strengthened or were missing related to pedestrian friendly development, lack of civic design, question the benefits of a prosperous economy, no mention of clean air and questioning the motive of local government.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
<p>Credit Valley Conservation</p> <p>Gary Murphy, Manager Planning</p> <p>July 29, 2005</p>	<p>Overall</p> <p>Proposed changes are broad based and require more discussions to formulate policy directions before policies can be formulated.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>All of the recent work completed by CVC over the past 10 years should be considered and the Official Plan policies should speak to new approaches being used in environmental planning.</p> <p>Watershed and Subwatershed Planning</p> <p>Include sections in the Official Plan to reference the subwatershed process including issue identification, plan development, implementation, monitoring, evaluating and updating. Include a section on the Environmental Implementation Reports (EIR) process.</p> <p>Include key principles of subwatershed studies as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop long term vision; ▪ Avoid cumulative impacts; and ▪ Support an adaptive management approach to the environment. <p>Ecosystem Based Approach</p> <p>Systems approach promotes strong emphasis on connectivity and linkages between natural features and protection of those features, functions and linkages as opposed to a features based approach.</p> <p>Official Plan policies should have a stronger emphasis on the retention, enhancement and restoration of natural features and areas given the continued urbanization of the City and the loss of natural cover.</p> <p>General</p> <p>Review provides an opportunity to include policies that further define an ecosystem approach to planning by including objectives, planning strategy, general policies and performance measures.</p> <p>Include policies that identify expectations and a planning process necessary to identify and conserve a sustainable ecosystem for the long-term.</p> <p>Brampton's environmental policies should look to protect locally significant features such as wetlands, ESA's and woodlots to ensure that the ecological system as a whole is being conserved.</p> <p>Suggest examining the Oak Ridges Moraine Plan and Technical Papers, which may support updated policies related to protection/enhancement of a natural heritage system.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
	<p>Pillar 3 of Brampton's Strategic Plan identifies Brampton's commitment to conserving and protecting significant environmental features. Request that restoration or improvement of these features and the natural heritage system should be included in the updated environmental policies.</p> <p>Suggest benchmarking the Town of Caledon to ensure all of the municipalities in the Region of Peel are represented in the study.</p> <p>Town of Halton Hills is about to approve a revised Official Plan with specific policies on watershed and subwatershed planning.</p> <p>Environmental Management Policies</p> <p>Suggest that the ecosystem approach to planning be defined to provide clarity on the City's leadership approach.</p> <p>Is the proposed new section to be entitled Environmental Impact Studies supposed to be Environmental Implementation Reports?</p> <p>Please provide the CVC with a copy of the Proposed Woodlot Strategy for Brampton.</p> <p>Criterion for establishing buffers/setbacks should be based on an examination of the natural hazards and natural heritage system through the Subwatershed Studies and Environmental Impact Reports as outlined in Section 4.4.10 of the current Official Plan.</p> <p>CVC supports the inclusion of policies that accentuate or emphasize a systems approach to the protection, maintenance, restoration and improvement of the long term ecological function and biodiversity of natural heritage systems.</p> <p>Reference should be made to Section 1.1.1 of the 2005 PPS as it refers to avoiding development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns.</p> <p>Review Town of Caledon's Official Plan for policies related to ecosystem planning, natural systems and linkages, environmental performance measures</p> <p>Section 3.3 and 4.4.5 should be updated to reflect the PPS emphasis on the maintenance, restoration and improvement of long term ecological function and biodiversity of natural heritage systems</p> <p>Section 4.4 should include an expanded reference to ecosystem planning and management with the inclusion of objectives, planning strategy, general policies and performance measures</p> <p>Section 4.4.1 The CVC agrees that a new section should be added entitled Subwatershed Study, which should be general in detail.</p> <p>This section should reference the latest provincial documents such as the Ministry of Environments Stormwater Planning and Design Manual.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
	<p>Section 4.4.5 should include policies that re-enforce the general ecosystem policies of Section 4.4 with emphasis on connectivity of the natural heritage system</p> <p>Section 4.4.5 to 4.4.9 Clarify if the “implementing guidelines for determining development limits” is a proposed policy or a separate document.</p> <p>Section 4.5.2 When trying to achieve maximum public access to public lands, consideration needs to be given to public safety and the protection of the natural heritage system features and functions.</p> <p>Section 4.5.7 Suggest a stronger approach with regards to the connectivity of open space linkage than noted in the discussion paper.</p> <p>Mapping</p> <p>Ensure that Schedule D reflects the latest efforts on crest of slope mapping used by the Region of Peel.</p> <p>Request that all wetlands and Environmentally Significant Areas should be shown on the mapping.</p> <p>Proposed City Wide parks in areas such as Northwest Brampton are conceptual and subject to further consideration through the Secondary and Block Planning stages.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
<p>Community Design, Parks Planning and Development Division</p> <p>John Spencer, Manager</p> <p>July 29, 2005</p>	<p>Clearly state if the entire document is based on an ecosystem approach to planning and also provide a definition of ecosystem approach.</p> <p>Also definitions should be provided of all terms such as Environmental Parks, Environmental Management and Open Space.</p> <p>Question the Conservation Authorities objective related to protecting, managing and restoring Ontario's woodlands, specifically because they have historically contributed no financial resources to woodlot preservation in Brampton.</p> <p>Request that reference be made to the possibility of revised Official Plan policies as a result of the Culture, Leisure and Recreation Master Plan.</p> <p>During the benchmarking exercise, the pending OMB dispute in the North Oakville Secondary Plan was not discussed.</p> <p>Similarly, a number of Mississauga initiatives were listed that were not included in the Official Plan.</p> <p>With respect to the City being a leader in Environmental Management, the City could adopt initiatives (such as those implemented in Mississauga) to achieve this goal.</p> <p>In agreement related to the need to emphasize the interconnectedness of natural features, concern however related to how lands are conveyed and who pays.</p> <p>In agreement that a general policy should be implemented to determine a consistent conservation setback.</p> <p>Suggest that a policy be included in the Official Plan with respect to requirements for the declaration of the health and the condition of prospective development sites and/or the presence of archaeological interest.</p> <p>Refer to Parks Culture & Recreation Master Plan in all instances.</p> <p>Unclear about the proposal in include a new section in the Official Plan referencing open space requirements through the block planning process.</p> <p>Concern that if a connected system of open space is achieved by incorporating hedgerows, it is not clear how these features would be paid for.</p> <p>For the City to place more emphasis on being a leader in environmental responsibility, the Official Plan should only include policy objectives that can reasonably be met, and not present the impression that the City is doing all of the things required by the PPS, the NHS and that the conservation authorities suggest should be done.</p>

Appendix D

Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
	<p>Remove reference to the inclusion of parkettes and neighbourhood parks on Schedule E.</p> <p>Suggest that policies be included in the Official Plan related to the gratuitous conveyance of woodlands.</p> <p>Uncertain if a policy regarding utility easements not being credited for parkland dedication is necessary in the Official Plan. Possibly just note that a Parkland Dedication Policy will be provided which will provide the detail of how parkland dedication is calculated.</p> <p>Important to resolve the issue of recommended setbacks or buffers to environmentally sensitive areas.</p> <p>No mention in the proposed policy directions of the creation of a Brampton Environmental Advisory Committee.</p> <p>Unclear what was meant in the Discussion Paper regarding clearly identifying the parks and open space requirements at the secondary plan and block plan stage, and about making the parks hierarchy section of the Official Plan more general.</p> <p>Include a definition of sensitive area, buffer and setback in the glossary.</p> <p>Request to review Appendix H of the Official Plan as it was not attached to the discussion paper.</p> <p>Confirm the terminology used in Section 4.4.5.8 and 4.4.10.4. Master Drainage Plan may no longer be relevant.</p> <p>Confirm if Environment Component Study is an appropriate term in Section 4.4.7.2.</p> <p>Suggest that “and conveyance, as is suitable” be added to Section 4.4.7.3.</p> <p>Woodlot Development Guidelines prepared by AgPlan in 1992 are still current and can continue to be referenced in Section 4.4.7.6.</p> <p>Section 4.4.8 Has consideration been given to the protection or identification of regionally significant wetlands?</p> <p>Section 4.4.8.2 States that an EIS may be required, should this statement be strengthened to state that an EIS <u>will</u> be required.</p> <p>Section 4.4.8.4 Revise to state “The City, in consultation with the Conservation Authority, may require vegetation buffer areas...” to indicate who is responsible to determine the buffer area.</p> <p>Section 4.4.8.5 Revise to indicate that wetlands may be non contact areas, where no public access is allowed.</p> <p>Section 4.4.8 Possibly include policies related to the requirement of a Wetland Management and Enhancement Report and the objectives of that report.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
	<p>Section 4.4.10 Buffers Setbacks and Linkages are things that should be entrenched in the Official Plan, they should not be negotiated on an application by application basis.</p> <p>Section 4.4.10.5 Should include “where appropriate” at the end of the last sentence.</p> <p>Reference should be made to the Block Plan process and the open space components that will be included as part of that process.</p> <p>The Open Space Landscaping and Pedestrian Concept Plan should be included under the new Block Plan section.</p> <p><i>Section 4.5.5</i> is currently under review and the park and facility provision strategies, including the park hierarchy, provision standards, orientation, locational criteria, etc. will all be assessed and recommendations provided through the Parks, Culture & Recreation Master Plan. Further work on the Parks, Culture & Recreation Master Plan study may prompt further amendments to this section, as appropriate.</p> <p><i>Section 5.30.2</i> should reference to the sections on Parkland Dedication Collection Policies’.</p> <p>Suggest that a description of “impact studies” be added to the Glossary. We are not sure if Block Plans would be listed here as well as several studies must be completed prior to the granting of Stage 2 approval to the Block Plan (synonymous with final approval of the block plan).</p>

Appendix D

Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
Retail	
Al Cormier Mississauga	<p>The following comments from Mr. Al Cormier are with respect to the Malone Given Parsons Retail Policy Review Study:</p> <p>The word 'sustainable' does not appear in the document. If it is used, it will eventually influence long term planning from a sustainable development perspective.</p> <p>The hierarchy of retail/commercial establishments proposed in the Retail Study should identify the transportation facilities needed to serve the establishments.</p> <p>The report states that since Brampton's population is expected to double by 2031, the amount of commercial space should also double. This assumption is difficult to support since many of the retail outlets also serve populations from outside of Brampton. Unless these surrounding areas also expected to double in population, then this major assumption is not valid.</p> <p>The report contains no analysis of the recent success/failure rates of the retail sector. Is there not a risk that encouraging too much retail space will threaten the viability of existing stores?</p> <p>The location of two possible regional scaled shopping centres (one in N.E. Brampton and one in NW) does not seem to match with possible high order transit links that might be justified in Brampton. The selection of these regional scaled shopping centre sites should dovetail with the planning of high order transportation links.</p> <p>The report allows for these regional scaled shopping centres to be 'non-enclosed'. Mr. Cormier disagrees with this concept, since it results in driving from store to store, and imposes access difficulties on seniors and persons with disabilities. An example of a shopping centre where such access difficulties are experienced is the Meadowvale Shopping Centre in Mississauga, which was once fully enclosed and surrounded by parking and transit terminal. It is now mainly non-enclosed and the parking lot is surrounded by stores. Transit users, seniors and disabled have significant walking distances to contend with. Auto users drive from store to store or are driven from store to store with resulting idling etc. And, this is not even a big box mall.</p> <p>With respect to the Central area, Mr. Cormier does not support the view that 'reduction in entrance ways' is desirable. In his view, several entrance ways improve access for all, from the street, from rear parking, from laneways etc.</p>
Region of Peel Tom Slomke Planning Manager-Brampton Development Planning Services (August 19, 2005)	<p>The Region of Peel is in general agreement with the directions taken in the Retail Policy Review Study but wishes to advise of certain concerns that should be addresses in any new policy formulation.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
<p>Sustainable Urban Development Association</p> <p>John Stillich General Manager (August 20, 2005)</p>	<p>Infrastructure Needs</p> <p>It is essential that Functional Servicing Reports and Traffic Impact Studies be required for significant changes in land use and initial construction in order to assess whether the appropriate infrastructure is available or whether enhancements are necessary.</p> <p>Commercial Corridors</p> <p>Some of the Commercial Corridors proposed in the Retail Study may abut Regional Roads. The main function of Regional Roads is to convey traffic and not to provide access to such uses. As such, the Region suggests inclusion of a policy that minimizes access, ensures safety for the users of Regional Roads and protects the function of Regional Roads. Traffic Impact Studies may be required to support access proposals and to identify roadway improvements at the cost of the developer. The policy should also state that the Region does not favour the use of the right-of-way for any commercial purpose and has policies with respect to the range of uses, facilities and landscape features permitted with the Regional Road right-of-way.</p> <p>Provincial Policy Statement</p> <p>The suburban retail locations as proposed in the Retail Study are reliant on automotive transportation systems and, as such, are not consistent with the policy intentions of the Province.</p> <p>Mount Pleasant GO Station</p> <p>A major retail centre located near the new Mount Pleasant GO Station could take advantage of the existing and future transportation systems.</p>
	<p>Sustainable Urban Development</p> <p>Sustainable Urban Development Association's principal recommendation to the City of Brampton is to plan retail and office spaces with better regard to the critical need to reduce both land and transportation requirements related to them.</p> <p>Energy consumption related to accessing both retail and office destinations cannot continue at their present levels. Brampton has paid lip-service to, but in essence ignored in practice, the environmental damage caused by low-density settlement patterns, including the elimination of natural and agricultural lands, and the high levels of emissions of toxins and greenhouse gases caused by both energy use and products required to maintain large properties. Unfortunately, the practices of the past appear to be largely preserved in the proposed plans for retail and office uses for greenfield lands.</p> <p>Sustainable urban development requires that the average</p>

Appendix D

Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
	<p>proximity between retail residents and their destinations be reduced to minimums. SUDA urges you to plan for a model where properties that will house retail or office activities are much more intensively used. That means mixing uses, multi-storey buildings, and significant modal shifts towards access by means other than personal automobile. The benefits of doing so are substantial and should not be dismissed.</p> <p>Developing urban intersections where both employees and visitors have easy, very close access to amenities such as restaurants, shopping and services is a concept that has not been applied in '905' municipalities. In addition to its uniqueness, such a concept also enables a greater portion of both office and retail employees to live close by.</p> <p>The City of Brampton is facing an extremely serious transportation crisis, a crisis wholly created by low-density and separation of uses zoning policies. Improvement in the situation, and minimizing future energy shocks, require that the intensification proposals in the proposed official plan amendments be aggressively met, and that greenfield lands be required to be developed at much higher densities than planned.</p> <p>The city is concerned about the long term supply of land in response to growth pressures. It is clear that replacing single-storey and single-use areas with more urban environments that use vertical space and reduced transportation spaces will stretch out the supply of land. Additionally, greater urban densities reduce the overall and per capita cost of infrastructure and annual operating costs. The result would be more public money available for better transit services and cultural and other public amenities, or relatively lower local tax rates.</p> <p>Equity</p> <p>Aside from environment-centred issues, I would like to comment about equity. The retail policy seems to give priority to large retailers at the expense of small and/or new businesses that are usually not permitted in large retail centres. The city should not simply follow marketing trends, which focus on multi-national chain stores dependent on imported goods from distant origins. Often, small businesses are relegated to industrial areas or isolated business 'parks' where the public does not readily pass by them; this is in contrast to the high visibility of 'big box' or regional/district centres. Creating mainstreet urban environments that give equal visibility and/or access to both large and small business is a better idea.</p> <p>It is important to keep in mind that business exists to make money from a customer base; the customers, mostly residents, do not exist to serve business. What this means is that planning priorities should be directed towards the overall well-being of residents, and that business will adapt to any given situation and conform to whatever rules are placed upon them by the city because of the business opportunities presented by close to 700,000 people.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
<p>Region of Halton Nancy Mott-Allen Manager, Current Planning Planning and Public Works (August 26, 2005)</p> <p>Zelinka Priamo Ltd. Harry Froussios Senior Planner (August 29, 2005)</p>	<p>The Sustainable Urban Development Association is able to provide more information about sustainable greenfield development via a model that accommodates 8,000 residents and 4,000 jobs per square kilometer in ways that meet the needs and goals of both the city and future residents. Please contact us for more information.</p> <p>SUDA hopes that this information is useful to the City of Brampton during its planning review process.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to review your Retail Policy Study. Halton Region Current Planning staff has reviewed the above noted document and has no comments to make at this time. Please continue to provide us with updates with respect to your Official Plan Review.</p> <p>We are the land use planning consultants for Loblaw Properties Ltd, operator of several food stores (Real Canadian Superstore, Fortinos and No Frills) within the City of Brampton. Our client has a vested interest in the decision-making for the future of retailing within the City and is pleased to participate in this process.</p> <p>Need to Update Existing Secondary Plans to Reflect Changes in Retail Policies</p> <p>We believe that the existing Secondary Plans should also be updated and amended to reflect any retail policy changes so that any remaining undeveloped lands, future redevelopment of existing commercial sites, or proposed amendments to add commercial lands are subject to the same policy structure as other sites within the City of Brampton.</p> <p>Requirement of Market Justification</p> <p>The Retail Policy Review Study notes that there is a demand for an additional 10.3 million square feet of retail/commercial space within Brampton to the year 2031, approximately 45% of which is unallocated. This additional floor area is proposed to be allocated amongst various commercial categories, which define a range of possible floor areas. Will market justification be required for implementation of these designations through Zoning By-law Amendments?</p> <p>Distinction of Retail Uses Permitted Within Industrial Areas</p> <p>We are concerned that retail warehouses would be permitted to locate within Industrial designations, whereas other large retailers who have similar land extensive requirements and are in the business of selling similar products that are offered within retail warehouses would not be permitted. As such, the range of commercial uses to be permitted within Industrial designations should be expanded or, alternatively, predominantly commercial uses should be restricted from industrial areas.</p>

Appendix D

Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
Office	
Halton Region Nancy Mott-Allen, Manager, Current Planning (May 24, 2005)	<p>Appreciates being circulated this documentation for review and remains interested in future Official Plan Review circulations from Brampton.</p> <p>The Region of Halton does not have any comment on the Office Strategy Discussion Paper but would like to be kept informed as this policy develops.</p>
Region of Peel Development Planning Services Tom Slomke, Planning Manager- Brampton (August 19, 2005)	<p>The Office Strategy Discussion Paper dated June 2005, proposes four major policy elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy to be more market-driven than in the past, 2. Combine three office node designations as part of the Central Area Transit Corridor, 3. Eliminate five office node designations but generally broaden the range of permitted uses, 4. Recognize Bram West as Primary Office Node. <p>The Discussion Paper notes that the current policy limits the range of office uses permitted in Employment Areas so as to protect the viability of the Downtown and Central Areas. Further, the Discussion Paper expects that the Bram West Employment Area is expected to account for 25% of total occupied major office space in Brampton.</p> <p>Maturity Parameters</p> <p>The primary rationale for the elimination of the five non-Central Areas Transit Corridor Office Nodes appears to be based upon the observation that significant office development has not yet happened, in spite of the policy stemming back as far as 1993. It is not unusual for office development to lag other forms of employment development, as the infrastructure needs for offices require more soft services that evolve over a longer time frame. It strikes some observers that the authors of the Discussion Paper may not have provided sufficient time for the areas to mature to the point where office development could be attracted. A case in point is the Mississauga City Centre which has only recently been able to attract significant office development.</p> <p>Under the current policy, the expected pattern would involve retaining sites as vacant, until required for office development. This could take many years. An alternative, alluded to in the Discussion Paper is to allow the areas to be used for general commercial uses, on an interim basis, until such time as the area offers the full range of infrastructure required for the types of office development contemplated in the 1993 Office Node concept.</p> <p>In order that the contemplated Office Node development can materialize at some point in the future, there could be an analysis of the required physical infrastructure required to support the office densities desired and a policy to reserve capacity to allow such developments to proceed. Further, the Official Plan policies and</p>

Appendix D

Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
	<p>Zoning By-law's could continue to permit the Office uses at desired densities, while also allowing alternate commercial land uses as interim uses. Under such a scenario, the Office Node concept does not disappear, but rather, be allowed to be phased into being.</p> <p>The alternate and expected interim land uses allows for appropriate utilization of existing infrastructure and perhaps can assist in the important function of supporting transit service better than the 'leave as vacant' until needed option.</p> <p>Bram West</p> <p>Regional Staff concur that future office development in Brampton will be "build to suit" in developing employment areas. We acknowledge that opportunities to attract such developments may occur at time frames that are inconsistent with the sequential staging the physical services. Tremendous discipline must be exercised by the developer in order to protect key sites for the narrow range of permitted uses appropriate for the traditional concept of an office node. Rather than an office node, market forces may provide for an 'office concentration' over a large geographic area within the Bram West Employment District. Recognition of this could start by renaming the designated area from "Primary Office Node" to another term that better describes the mixed use nature of the area.</p> <p>Provincial Policy Statement</p> <p>Little is directly said in the Provincial Policy Statement that impacts upon the planning for offices, however, threaded through-out the statement is that increased density and transit supportive designs are required. Suburban "build to suit" environments are reliant upon automotive transportation systems, and as such are not consistent with the policy intentions of the Province. Travel Demand Management may hold many tactics suitable for implementation in the emerging Bram West Employment Area, including office development. A policy requiring the availability of transit service prior to the development of office uses could be considered, although the practicality of this is suspect. When transit services do become available, they should be integrated with Mississauga Transit system as the area's success would be predicated upon its reputation as an extension of the Meadowvale area.</p> <p>The Provincial Policy Statement refers to stated employment targets. The structure of both the Region's and Brampton's Official Plan does not establish employment targets per se, nor is there a differentiation between basic employment and 'population-based employment'. This is an area that requires further discussion between Regional Staff and Local Planning Staff.</p> <p>The policies that allow general commercial uses within existing office nodes should require that new development be designed to be pedestrian friendly and transit supportive.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
	<p>Infrastructure Planning</p> <p>The physical infrastructure required to support industrial and commercial uses can vary widely. Transportation capacity, water demands and sanitary service requirements can range from low to high. Further, it is not unusual to experience occupancy changes during the reasonable life span of the buildings and such occupancy changes can and do bring differing infrastructure demands. Flexibility is taken into account in the design of the infrastructure supporting industrial and commercial development. Notwithstanding this, it is essential that Functional Servicing Reports and Traffic Impact Studies be required for initial construction and significant changes in land use in order to assess whether the appropriate infrastructure is available or whether enhancements are necessary.</p> <p>Travel Demand Management</p> <p>Regional Official Plan Amendment 16 introduces Travel Demand Management to the lexicon of transportation planning. Designation of the Bram West Employment Area as the Primary Office Node for the City of Brampton provides the opportunity to implement Travel Demand Management techniques within the area. It is recommended that Travel Demand Management Plans be a requirement of significant office developments within the area.</p> <p>Mount Pleasant GO Station</p> <p>During our internal discussions, Regional staff had discussed the opportunity of a mix-use centre near the new Mount Pleasant GO Station. It would not operate as an Office Node, however a concentration of offices could take advantage of the existing and future transportation systems.</p>
<p>SUDA (Sustainable Urban Development Association) John Stillich General Manager (August 20, 2005)</p>	<p>SUDA's principal recommendation to the City of Brampton is to plan retail and office spaces with better regard to the critical need to reduce both land and transportation requirements related to them.</p> <p>It should be very clear to Brampton city officials that energy consumption related to accessing both retail and office destinations cannot continue at their present levels. Energy prices will continue to rise quickly over the time horizon of the official plan, given global economics and declining reserves of fossil fuels.</p> <p>Brampton has paid lip-service to, but in essence ignored in practice, the environmental damage caused by low-density settlement patterns, including the elimination of natural and agricultural lands, and the high levels of emissions of toxins and greenhouse gases caused by both energy use and products required to maintain large properties. Unfortunately, the practices of the past appear to be largely preserved in the proposed plans for retail and office uses for greenfield lands. Both current and future residents and taxpayers of Brampton will face increasing</p>

Appendix D

Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
	<p>hardship if significant changes in zoning practices are not implemented.</p> <p>Sustainable urban development requires that the average proximity between retail residents and their destinations be reduced to minimums. That means a much more intensive use of land than currently envisaged by the city, and moving towards a very different transportation system. SUDA urges you to plan for a model where properties that will house retail or office activities are much more intensively used. That means mixing uses, multi-storey buildings, and significant modal shifts towards access by means other than personal automobile. The benefits of doing so are substantial and should not be dismissed.</p> <p>As an example, where the choices are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A single use, single-storey retail centre set in the midst of parking spaces for 95% of visitors to the site, a separately located office park of buildings set back from the street and also surrounded by parking for 90%-95% of employees and visitors, and a group of high rise condominium or apartment buildings, or 2. An urban intersection occupied by multi-use, multi-storey buildings set back between 5 to 10 metres from the curb, served by a public parking garage or two behind the properties and well-served by public transportation, <p>Choose the latter. The result is an energy-efficient, land-efficient, easily accessible, economically attractive, and very distinctive area. It is a model that can, and should be, replicated across the city.</p> <p>The City of Brampton's office strategy seeks to find a way to increase the city's share of office space in the GTA, despite its location at the population fringe of the region. Developing urban intersections where both employees and visitors have easy, very close access to amenities such as restaurants, shopping and services is a concept that has not been applied in '905' municipalities. In addition to its uniqueness, such a concept also enables a greater portion of both office and retail employees to live close by.</p> <p>SUDA recommends strongly that Brampton <i>NOT</i> follow the example of the Meadowvale employment area or traditional retail models such as Erin Mills Town Centre of Oakville Place. They are inefficient and environmentally damaging. We recommend a more urban approach that also includes higher residential densities, including higher densities for ground-oriented homes.</p> <p>The City of Brampton is facing an extremely serious transportation crisis, a crisis wholly created by low-density and separation of uses zoning policies. Improvement in the situation, and minimizing future energy shocks, require that the intensification proposals in the proposed official plan amendments be aggressively met, and that greenfield lands be required to be developed at much higher</p>

Appendix D

Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
	<p>densities than planned.</p> <p>The city is concerned about the long term supply of land in response to growth pressures. It is clear that replacing single-storey and single-use areas with more urban environments that use vertical space and reduced transportation spaces will stretch out the supply of land. Additionally, greater urban densities reduce the overall and per capita cost of infrastructure and annual operating costs. The result would be more public money available for better transit services and cultural and other public amenities, or relatively lower local tax rates.</p> <p>Creating higher density mainstreet environments also improves personal health by promoting walking – an activity that surveys show people value. Arrangements that enable people to avoid driving personal motor vehicles by bringing destinations closer or making public transit more convenient, should be pursued.</p> <p>An Unrelated Comment</p> <p>Aside from environment-centred issues, I would like to comment about equity. The retail policy seems to give priority to large retailers at the expense of small and/or new businesses that are usually not permitted in large retail centres. The city should not simply follow marketing trends, which focus on multi-national chain stores dependent on imported goods from distant origins. Often, small businesses are relegated to industrial areas or isolated business ‘parks’ where the public does not readily pass by them; this is in contrast to the high visibility of ‘big box’ or regional/district centres. Creating mainstreet urban environments that give equal visibility and/or access to both large and small business is a better idea.</p> <p>It is important to keep in mind that business exists to make money from a customer base; the customers, mostly residents, do not exist to serve business. What this means is that planning priorities should be directed towards the overall well-being for its residents, and that business will adapt to any given situation and conform to whatever rules are placed upon them by the city because of the business opportunities presented by close to 700,000 people.</p> <p>The Sustainable Urban Development Association is able to provide more information about sustainable greenfield development via a model that accommodates 8,000 residents and 4,000 jobs per square kilometer in ways that meet the needs and goals of both the city and future residents. Please contact us for more information.</p>

Appendix D
Summary of Input Received on Each Focus Area Discussion Papers

Stakeholder /Affiliation	Comment
Population, Housing and Employment Forecasts	
Stephanie Cox & Vince Ramelli Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board May 17, 2005	<p>In April 2005 the Boards met with City of Brampton staff to discuss the Brampton Growth Management & Accelerated Official Plan Review Program. The Board is satisfied with the current growth management objectives and guidelines with respect to Catholic schools. As a result of the discussion & the information provided, the Board will incorporate the updated population information into future school board projections.</p> <p>It is important to note that demographics & ethnicity will play a vital role in the rate of need and construction of school sites.</p> <p>While population is a key factor, there are other factors that may affect the timing of school site construction. The timing of a required facility as noted in the guidelines may need to be amended from time to time.</p> <p>The Board is supportive of a decelerated growth plan relative to recent years, however understands the challenges of the City to cap development.</p>
Paul Mountford Peel District School Board May 3, 2005	<p>The Peel District School Board has reviewed the Discussion Paper on Population, Housing & Employment and the 2004 Development Outlook Report and has no comments on either Report. Board staff and their consultant met with City staff to review growth numbers in April 2005 and will be incorporating these numbers into the Boards enrolment projections. C.N. Watson has been hired as the consultant for the Peel District School Board.</p>